

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PAUL C.,¹

Plaintiff,

vs.

ANDREW SAUL, Commissioner of
Social Security,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:18-cv-00369-AA
OPINION AND ORDER

AIKEN, District Judge:

Before the Court is the Commissioner of Social Security’s (“Commissioner”) motion for an order altering the Court’s Opinion, Order, and Judgment remanding this matter for further administrative proceedings (docs. 17, 18).

Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure permits district courts to reconsider and amend a previous order or judgment, but reconsideration is an “extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and

¹ In the interest of privacy, this opinion uses only the first name and the initial of the last name of the non-governmental party or parties in this case.

conservation of judicial resources.” *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, reconsideration, 890 (9th Cir. 2000). Indeed, “a motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *Id.* Here, the Commissioner seeks reconsideration based on clear error. Having reviewed the previous Opinion and Order, the Commissioner’s Motion, and the related briefing, the Court finds that the Commissioner’s motion does not present grounds for the extraordinary remedy of reconsideration.

The Commissioner’s Motion to Correct/Amend Judgment (doc. 19) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 31st day of December 2020.

/s/Ann Aiken
Ann Aiken
United States District Judge